



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,185	12/14/2000	Danny Charles Bowman	2552-011	9139
4678 7590 05/09/2007 MACCORD MASON PLLC 300 N. GREENE STREET, SUITE 1600 P. O. BOX 2974 GREENSBORO, NC 27402			EXAMINER GAKH, YELENA G	
			ART UNIT 1743	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/737,185
Filing Date: December 14, 2000
Appellant(s): BOWMAN ET AL.

MAILED
MAY 09 2007
GROUP 1700

Howard A. MacCord, Jr.
For Appellant

SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the Reply Brief filed 02/06/07 in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed 01/30/07. The response to arguments here supplements those in the Examiner's Answer.

(10) Response to Argument

The examiner would like to make several comments to the Reply. Regarding 112, second paragraph, the Appellants' reference to In re Gordon regarding location of elements in a device, which can be critical, is not relevant to the instant application. In Gordon the location of the

Art Unit: 1743

elements concerns structural relations between different parts of the same device, while in the instant application different locations are claimed for a group of identical vessels, which are irrelevant to their structure. Regarding the "wherein" clause, it is totally clear from the examiner's Office action that there was no question regarding patentability of such structural limitation as a wireless electronic memory tag attached to the vessel. The question was raised regarding locations of a group of vessels, which are not structurally limiting. Regarding claim 18, the method step requires "electronically storing data" without any reference as to which type of data (related to the vessel, to the sample, to the manufacturer, etc.) should be stored on the electronic tag, which renders the claim indefinite. The remaining Appellants' remarks were fully addressed in the Examiner's Answer of 01/30/07. There are a few comments related to the rejection over the prior art. Regarding rejection over Petrick, the Appellants' drawing shows a form (a label) and the electronic tag, with e.g. claim 12 reciting the label, and on page 3, line 20 of the specification the Appellants use the terms "forms " and "labels" as analogous. Therefore, there is no "teaching away" in Petrick's disclosure. The visibility of de-association of the tag from the form is not a critical part of Petrick's invention, contrary to the Appellants' statement, and is an obvious modification of the Appellants' invention for the reasons indicated by the examiner. As for Berney's reference, moving vessels with specimens from one place to another (from a bench to a patient to a test site) means transporting vessels, so the Appellants' questioning in regards to Berney's transportation of the vessels is unclear. As for a detachable support, the Appellants do not claim unattachable electronic tag, and "attachable" does not mean that the support is unattached during various manipulations with tubes. As for the Appellants' statement that "the tag is held to the test tube in fingers", the examiner is not quite sure, where the Appellants saw fingers in Berney's drawings.

Respectfully submitted,

Yelena G. Gakh, Ph.D.

**YELENA GAKH**
PRIMARY EXAMINER